



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/997,587	11/28/2001	Hayden Clavie Cranford JR.	RAL920010011US2 (IRA-10-5)	6239
26675	7590	02/04/2005	EXAMINER	
DRIGGS, LUCAS BRUBAKER & HOGG CO. L.P.A. DEPT. IRA 8522 EAST AVENUE MENTOR, OH 44060			LIU, SHUWANG	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2634	

DATE MAILED: 02/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/997,587

Applicant(s)

CRANFORD ET AL

Examiner

Shuwang Liu

Art Unit

2634

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 April 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/28/01.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The examiner suggests updating status of the cited applications (see page 1) and filing the correct application number and filing date instead of the empty spaces in the specification if appropriate.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-17 are objected to because of the following informalities:

(1) In claims 1 and 9, line 2, insert - -serial data- - after "incoming", respectively;

(2) In claim 1, line 3, insert - -edge location - - before "detector" in order to be consistent with the limitation recited in line 8;

(3) In claim 1, line 3, claim 9, line 4, and claim 17, line 8, change "a data stream" to - -the incoming serial data stream- -, respectively;

(4) In claim 7, line 1, change "7" to - -6- -;

(5) In claim 15, line 2, "none are" may be changed to - -none of the samples is- -;

(6) In claim 17, line 11, change "a" to - -the- -;

(7) In claim 17, line 14, change "the phase rotator" to - - the 54 step phase rotation device- -; and

Art Unit: 2634

(8) In claim 17, line 16, change "a phase locked loop" to - the phase locked loop-

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specification does not describe "a generator for creating an early and a late signal if the detected edge is not in its expected location" as recited in claim 1, lines 4-5, or "a generator for generating an early and a late signal if the detected edge is not in its expected position" as recited in claim 17, lines 10-11. The specification only teaches "generates an early or late signal, if the detected edge is not at its expected position" instead of generating an early and a late signal (see page 9 in the specification, lines 12-13).

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

(1) regarding claim 1:

It is contradictory that "the early or late outputs from the edge location detector" as recited in lines 7-8 with "a generator for creating an early and a late signal" as recited in lines 4. It has to clarify whether the early or the late signal outputs from the edge location detector or the generator.

(2) regarding claim 9:

Claim 9 recites the limitation "the edge location detector" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

(3) regarding claim 17:

Claim 17 recites the limitation "the edge correlation outputs" and "the phase rotator in line 14. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 17 recites the limitation "the early and late generating circuitry" in line 15. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Art Unit: 2634

Double Patenting

7. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

8. Claim 9 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 8-9 of copending Application No. 2004/0066871. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because digital detecting, generating and sending, and processing and controlling steps as recited in the instant application are corresponding to estimating, detecting, and adjusting steps of the copending application, respectively.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

9. Claim 9 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 47 of copending

Art Unit: 2634

application No. 2002/0009170. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the broader application claims would have been obvious in view of the narrow issued claims (see *In re Emert*, 124 F.3d 1458, 44 USPQ2d 1149).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shuwang Liu whose telephone number is 571 272-3036. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Chin can be reached on 571 272-3056. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2634

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Shuwang Liu
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2634

February 2, 2005